

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on 05/28/2004 (hereinafter referred to as the OA) has been received, and its contents carefully studied. The applicant presents this response and amendment which applicant believes is fully responsive to the OA.

The applicant further believes that for the reasons set out below, the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests consideration for allowance.

Claim Rejections

Rejections Under 35 USC §112, 35 USC §102, 35 USC §103

Applicant has submitted new claims which moot the rejections of the prior pending claims. In order to further prosecution on the merits, Applicant will comment on the newly presented claims vis-à-vis the prior rejections.

Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Prior pending independent claims 21 and 60 had been rejected under 35 USC §102 in light of Melen et al., UK Patent Application 2191030. Although Applicant respectfully

disagrees with the rejections (see Applicant's prior office action response; the arguments will not be repeated here in the interests of brevity and readability), Applicant has presented new claims which embody the particular embodiment of the disclosed bonus game which uses three concentrically mounted wheels, where the three wheels have specific logical relationships to each other. The claiming of the specific wheel embodiment clearly puts the pending claims outside of Melen, as Melen does not disclose the use of concentrically mounted wheels in any form.

Rejections Under 35 USC §103

The OA rejected prior independent claim 66 using Melen in light in Takemoto. Takemoto shows concentric wheels in a game, where the wheels are used to show a single triangular pattern to a player in order to show a win event (the triangular pattern is made up of three portions of disks when they line up correctly). The presently pending independent claims have functional relationships between wheels not taught or disclosed by Takemoto (Takemoto does not have any teachings towards the use of the wheels to show relative movement between wheels or prize amounts, coupled with a win indicator, as do the presently pending claims). In light of the fact that there are at least functional relationships between elements in the newly presented claims missing from the cited prior art, related issues such as a teaching to combine are not reached.

Conclusion

For at least the fact that Melen does not teach the elements in the presently pending independent claims, and Takemoto does not teach or disclose the claimed functional relationship between wheel elements of the presently pending independent claims, the cited prior art does not anticipate or make obvious the newly presented claims. Applicant respectfully requests consideration for allowance the presently pending claims therefore.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: 24-Nov-04

Russ F. Marsden
Reg. No. 43,775

Russ F. Marsden
Alliance Gaming, Inc.
Bally Systems, Inc.
6601 South Bermuda Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89119
Phone: 775-225-5437